

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors, and have added a new independent Claim 18, which combines the limitations of Claims 1 and 14. The above amendments do not add any new matter. Claims 1-18 remain in the application, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrey (USPN 6,542,750) in view of Beming (USPN 5,740,537). Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants submit that the combined teachings of Hendrey and Beming do not render Claims 1-17 obvious because those combined teachings fail to teach all of the limitations recited in Claim 1 and included by dependency in Claims 2-17.

More specifically, the combined teachings of Hendrey and Beming fail to teach the limitations recited in Claims 1 and 18 and included by dependency in Claim 2-17 of “*computing an entity density function for a plurality of density calculation zones*” and “*detecting that a predetermined proximity threshold has been exceeded.*” The Examiner concedes that Hendrey fails to teach these limitations but claims that Beming teaches these limitations at col. 10, lines 38-67 and FIG. 4. Applicants disagree.

First, Applicants submit that although Beming teaches the calculation of density functions, these are not the “entity” density function as recited in Claims 1 and 18. The entity density function in the present invention is a function of the density of entities or units in a given area (*see e.g.*, page 8, lines 5-8), and the proximity density threshold relates to a minimum number of entities in close proximity to each other (*see e.g.*, page 8, lines 28-30). By contrast, Beming teaches a method and circuitry for selectively permitting additional users to communicate in the communication system (*see, e.g.*, col. 1, lines 10-13). The density function taught in Beming is based on determining “levels of communication quality” of ongoing communication in a communication system (*see, e.g.*, col. 10, lines 41-45; Abstract). When a request is made to admit additional communication, the additional communication is admitted only when any one or more of the determined levels of communication is better than a selected threshold value for communication quality (*see e.g.*, col. 10, lines 47-49 and 59-67).

Accordingly, based on the above argument, Applicants submit that the combined teachings of Hendrey and Beming do not render Claims 1 and 18 obvious because the combined

teachings fail to teach all of the limitations recited in Claims 1 and 18. Therefore, Claims 1 and 18 are in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-17, which depend from and include all of the limitations of Claim 1, are likewise in a condition for allowance for all of the same reasons above associated with Claim 1.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Moreover, the absence of an argument with respect to any limitation of any claim in the present application is not meant to be an admission that the limitation is taught or suggested by the references cited herein or any other reference. Therefore Applicants reserve the right to make additional arguments not included herein, including arguments regarding limitations of each of the claims not addressed herein.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department  
1303 E. Algonquin Road  
Law Department  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By: 

Valerie M. Davis  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847.576.6733  
Fax No.: 847.576.0721